



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/047,925	01/14/2002	Raymond Moore	020375-008600US	2629

20350 7590 05/29/2003

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP  
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER  
EIGHTH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

MEINECKE DIAZ, SUSANNA M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3623

DATE MAILED: 05/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/047,925

Applicant(s)

MOORE, RAYMOND

Examiner

Susanna M. Diaz

Art Unit

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2002 and 24 July 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant filed a Preliminary Amendment on July 24, 2002.

Claims 1-27 are presented for examination.

***Declaration***

2. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

Non-initialed and/or non-dated alterations have been made to the oath or declaration. See 37 CFR 1.52(c).

Please see the non-initialed correction of the post office address.

***Specification***

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informality:

On page 10, line 9 of the specification, please fill in the missing application number (presumably 10/028,471).

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Objections***

4. Claim 27 is objected to because of the following informality:

Claim 27, line 1, delete "computer-related storage medium", insert --computer system--

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

6. Claims 1-3 and 7-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by CACI's FieldForce Planning services and territory optimization software, which are commonly used together, as disclosed in:

"CACI Information Solutions" (published Summer 2001 in Marketing Solutions Today and retrieved from <URL: [http://www.caci.co.uk/pdfs/mst\\_Summer\\_2001.pdf](http://www.caci.co.uk/pdfs/mst_Summer_2001.pdf)> on May 17, 2003]); and .

"CACI Limited Home Page" (dated June 2001 and retrieved from <URL: <http://web.archive.org/web/20010610010807/www.caci.co.uk>> on May 26, 2003]).

CACI discloses a method for managing a geographical distribution of business representatives, the method comprising:

[Claim 1] receiving a trace defining a closed geographical area ("CACI Information Solutions": Pages 6-7; "CACI Limited Home Page": Page 5 -- Identifying a closed geographical area is inherent to allow CACI to analyze the sales territory(ies) to be optimized);

identifying at least one geographical unit within the closed geographical area (“CACI Information Solutions”: Page 6, ¶¶ 2-4, InSite Field Force map; Page 7, ¶¶ 5-6, figure; “CACI Limited Home Page”: Page 5); and

receiving information regarding the at least one geographical unit in response to input from a user (“CACI Information Solutions”: Page 6, ¶¶ 2-4, InSite Field Force map; Page 7, ¶¶ 5-6, figure; “CACI Limited Home Page”: Page 5);

[Claim 7] wherein the at least one geographical unit is comprised by a hierarchy of geographical units (“CACI Information Solutions”: Page 6, ¶¶ 2-4, InSite Field Force map; Page 7, ¶¶ 5-6, figure; “CACI Limited Home Page”: Page 5);

[Claim 8] wherein the at least one geographical unit is comprised by an established set of geographical units (“CACI Information Solutions”: Page 6, ¶¶ 2-4, InSite Field Force map; Page 7, ¶¶ 5-6, figure; “CACI Limited Home Page”: Page 5);

[Claim 10] updating an assignment of business representatives to geographical units in accordance with a change in the established set of geographical units (“CACI Information Solutions”: Page 6, ¶¶ 2-4, InSite Field Force map; Page 7, ¶¶ 5-6, figure; “CACI Limited Home Page”: Page 5);

[Claim 12] displaying an assignment of a plurality of business representatives to a plurality of geographical units graphically (“CACI Information Solutions”: Page 6, ¶¶ 2-4, InSite Field Force map; Page 7, ¶¶ 5-6, figure; “CACI Limited Home Page”: Page 5);

[Claim 25] modifying a stored characteristic of the at least one geographical unit in response to the received information (“CACI Information Solutions”: Page 6, ¶¶ 2-4, InSite Field Force map; Page 7, ¶¶ 5-6, figure; “CACI Limited Home Page”: Page 5);

[Claim 2] wherein modifying the stored characteristic of the at least one geographical unit comprises assigning a business representative to the at least one geographical unit (“CACI Information Solutions”: Page 6, ¶¶ 2-4, InSite Field Force map; Page 7, ¶¶ 5-6, figure; “CACI Limited Home Page”: Page 5);

[Claim 3] wherein assigning a business representative to the at least one geographical unit comprises substituting the business representative to the at least one geographical unit (“CACI Information Solutions”: Page 6, ¶¶ 2-4, InSite Field Force map; Page 7, ¶¶ 5-6, figure; “CACI Limited Home Page”: Page 5);

[Claim 9] wherein modifying the stored characteristic of the at least one geographical unit comprises removing the at least one geographical unit from an established set of geographical units (“CACI Information Solutions”: Page 6, ¶¶ 2-4, InSite Field Force map; Page 7, ¶¶ 5-6, figure; “CACI Limited Home Page”: Page 5 -- Territories can be reorganized into a different subset of territories);

[Claim 11] wherein modifying the stored characteristic of the at least one geographical unit comprises adding the at least one geographical unit to an established set of geographical units (“CACI Information Solutions”: Page 6, ¶¶ 2-4, InSite Field Force map; Page 7, ¶¶ 5-6, figure; “CACI Limited Home Page”: Page 5 -- Territories can be reorganized into a different subset of territories).

[Claims 13-18, 26] Claims 13-18 and 26 recite limitations already addressed by the rejection of claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 12, and 25 above; therefore, the same rejection applies.

[Claims 19-24, 27] Claims 19-24 and 27 recite limitations already addressed by the rejection of claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 12, and 25 above; therefore, the same rejection applies.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over CACI's FieldForce Planning services and territory optimization software, which are commonly used together, as disclosed in:

"CACI Information Solutions" (published Summer 2001 in Marketing Solutions Today and retrieved from <URL: [http://www.caci.co.uk/pdfs/mst\\_Summer\\_2001.pdf](http://www.caci.co.uk/pdfs/mst_Summer_2001.pdf)> on May 17, 2003]); and

"CACI Limited Home Page" (dated June 2001 and retrieved from <URL: <http://web.archive.org/web/20010610010807/www.caci.co.uk>> on May 26, 2003]), and as applied to claim 1 above.

CACI discloses the input of a specified geographic territory data, which implies the use of a type of trace to define the specified geographic territory and subterritories thereof; however, CACI fails to expressly teach that a trace may be entered in the form

of a freehand trace (claim 4), using either a pen and digitizing tablet (claim 5) or a touch screen (claim 6). However, Official Notice is taken that it is old and well-known in the art of graphical user interface to allow a user to input data using a freehand trace, via a pen and digitizing tablet or a touch screen. These input methods allow a user to more conveniently enter data, especially data associated with various geographic coordinates (i.e., data which would require multiple inputs through a keyboard as opposed to a quick stroke of the hand to manually draw out or select a particular geographic area).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to implement with CACI the ability of a user to enter geographical territory data in the form of a freehand trace (claim 4), using either a pen and digitizing tablet (claim 5) or a touch screen (claim 6) in order to allow the user to more conveniently enter data, especially data associated with various geographic coordinates (i.e., data which would require multiple inputs through a keyboard as opposed to a quick stroke of the hand to manually draw out or select a particular geographic area).

### ***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure.

Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,067,525) -- Discloses an integrated computerized sales force automation system.

Shinozaki (JP 2000-242690 A) -- Discloses the optimization of assigning a sales force to various sales territories.



Grenfell ("A Predictive Model of Field Sales Activity for Sales Territory Design Using GIS") -- Discloses the use of Geographic Information Systems, GIS, to optimize salesperson planning among various sales territories.

Boucher ("Selecting the Right Number of Salespeople for the Job") -- Discloses the optimization of salesperson assignment throughout various sales territories.

Skiera et al. ("COSTA: Contribution Optimizing Sales Territory Alignment") -- Discloses the theory behind optimizing sales territories.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susanna M. Diaz whose telephone number is (703) 305-1337. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (703) 305-9643.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1113.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

**Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450**

or faxed to:

**(703)305-7687** [Official communications; including  
After Final communications labeled  
"Box AF"]

Application/Control Number: 10/047,925

Page 9

Art Unit: 3623

**(703)746-7048**

[Informal/Draft communications, labeled  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 5, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, 22202, 7<sup>th</sup> floor receptionist.

*Susanna Diaz*

Susanna M. Diaz

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 3623

May 26, 2003